

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office action mailed April 24, 2007. Currently, claims 63-84 are pending. Applicants have amended claims 63, 69 and 78 and withdrawn claims 1-62 and 85-105. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 63-84.

I. Summary of the Examiner's Objections

Claim 78 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 63-84 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,868,370 (hereinafter "*Burbridge*").

II. Summary of the Amendments

Claims 1-62 and 85-105 have been withdrawn.

Claims 63, 69 and 78 have been amended.

III. Restriction Requirement

Examiner has required restriction to one of four groups of claims, the groups comprising:

Group I: claims 1-29;

Group II: claims 30-62;

Group III: claims 63-84; and

Group IV: claims 85-105.

During a phone conversation with Attorney Vierra on April 2, 2007, a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute claims 63-84 of Group III, with traverse. Applicant affirms the election of Group III, with traverse.

IV. Rejection under 35 USC §112

Examiner rejected claim 78 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, indicating that the term "real time" is relative and renders the claim indefinite. Applicant has amended claim 78 to indicate that "each of said toolsets receives information modified by users instantly." Support for the amendment can be found on page 18, lines 6-8, which discloses:

The system provides this solution to users in real time, so that all information modified by users is instantly available to other users in the system, creating even greater efficiency.

Applicant submits that the rejection is now moot and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

V. Rejection under USC §102(b) over Burbridge

Claims 63-68

Claims 63-68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,868,370 (hereinafter “*Burbridge*”). Because *Rankin* fails to disclose each limitation of claims 63-68, Applicant asserts that these claims are patentable over the cited art.

Select features of embodiments of Applicant’s invention as described above can be found in claim 63 which recites among other limitations:

a data store for item specification data, including item attributes, for objects incorporated into or consumed during the creation of the asset;

a project management system including a data store interface that supplements business objects with specification data.

Burbridge does not disclose the invention as recited in claim 63. *Burbridge* discloses a system for collecting information throughout a plant and/or component design process. The system may store documents such as a project schedule, organizational chart, meeting minutes and progress reports in a database. The database can be accessed over a network by users having different security clearances. Based on a user’s security clearance, the user may access certain documents and red line the documents. The system also provides for administrative functions, including display of cost tracking and budget data, review of project purchasing information, tracking purchase orders. A project may have a relationship with a contact, client and project issue.

Nowhere does *Burbridge* disclose a data store interface that “*that supplements business objects with specification data,*” where the specification data includes “item attributes” and is for “objects incorporated into or consumed during the creation of the asset” as recited in claim 63. *Burbridge* discloses documents are stored during a plant design process and that the documents may be assigned different security clearance levels. The documents are not objects “consumed during the creation of an asset” as recited in claim 63. Additionally, storing the objects and accessing the

objects by a user with a correct security clearance does not disclose supplementing a “business object” with “specification data” as recited in claim 63. *Burbridge* does not disclose linking or supplementing any type of business object with specification data as embodied in claim 63.

Rejections of previously pending claims having a limitation similar to that of claim 63 are not supported by cited portions of *Burbridge*. For example, previously pending claim 73 contained a limitation of “a data input and supplement toolset linking specification data to business objects” which is similar to the distinguishing limitation of claim 63. In rejecting claim 73 under *Burbridge*, Examiner cited to column 1 “generally” and to column 2, lines 1-10. Column 1 of *Burbridge* contains a Cross Reference to related applications, a Background section which discloses what a plant life cycle is and problems of storing different types of information having different security clearances, and a portion of the Summary which discloses that the project management section includes a database for storing information and providing information to engineers simultaneously. Lines 1-10 of column 2 indicate that the project management component includes “tools” of project documents, drawing software enabling drawings to be created, and an instrument index which tracks equipment in a plant. The cited portions of *Burbridge* do not disclose a “toolset” for “linking specification data to business objects” as recited in claim 73 or “data store interface that supplements business objects with specification data” as recited in claim 63.

Because *Burbridge* fails to disclose each limitation of claim 63, Applicant asserts that claim 63 is patentable over the cited art. Claims 64-68 each ultimately depend from claim 63 and should be patentable for at least the same reasons in addition to the distinguishable elements they recite.

Claims 69-72

Claims 69-72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,868,370 (hereinafter “*Burbridge*”). Because *Rankin* fails to disclose each limitation of claims 69-72, Applicant asserts that these claims are patentable over the cited art.

Select features of embodiments of Applicant’s invention as described above can be found in claim 69 which recites among other limitations:

a data store for item specification data, including item attributes, for objects incorporated into or consumed during the creation of the asset;
at least one data input system for storing specification data associated with a business object into the data store.

Burbridge does not disclose the invention as recited in claim 69. *Burbridge* discloses a system for collecting information throughout a plant and/or component design process and providing access to the information for users based on user security clearance. *Burbridge* does not disclose a data store interface for “storing *specification data associated with a business object into the data store*,” where the specification data includes “item attributes” and is for “*objects incorporated into or consumed during the creation of the asset*” as recited in claim 69. *Burbridge* discloses documents stored during a plant design process and assigning the documents different security clearance levels. Storing the objects and accessing the objects by a user with a correct security clearance does not disclose “specification data associated with a business object” as recited in claim 69.

Because *Burbridge* fails to disclose each limitation of claim 69, Applicant asserts that claim 69 is patentable over the cited art. Claims 70-72 each ultimately depend from claim 69 and should be patentable for at least the same reasons in addition to the distinguishable elements they recite.

Claims 73-84

Claims 73-84 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,868,370 (hereinafter “*Burbridge*”). Because *Rankin* fails to disclose each limitation of claims 73-84, Applicant asserts that these claims are patentable over the cited art.

Claim 73 includes a limitation of “linking specification data to business objects” similar to the distinguishing limitation of “supplementing business objects with specification data” of claim 63. Claim 73 should be patentable over *Burbridge* for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 63. Dependent claims 74-84 each ultimately depend from claim 73 and should be patentable for at least the same reasons in addition to the distinguishable elements they recite

Conclusion

Based on the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of Claims 63-84 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including today, October 24, 2007.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 24, 2007

By: /Stephen R. Bachmann/
Stephen R. Bachmann
Reg. No. 50,806

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DeNIRO LLP
575 Market Street, Suite 2500
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 369-9660
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665